

Federal Council.

PROBLEM OF COLONIES

MATERIAL FOR STUDY BY
THE CHURCHES OF AMERICA

"Governments
are instituted
among men, de-
riving their just
powers from the
consent of the
governed."

From
THE DECLARATION
of INDEPENDENCE



Sam
Int.
rel.

JUN 2 1939

The PROBLEM *of* COLONIES

MATERIAL FOR STUDY BY
THE CHURCHES OF AMERICA

"It particularly devolves upon Christians to devote themselves to securing by voluntary action of their nations such changes in the international order as are from time to time required to avoid injustice and to promote equality of opportunity for individuals throughout the world."

From "THE MESSAGE AND DECISIONS OF OXFORD"

Published by

THE DEPARTMENT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE AND GOODWILL
FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA

297 Fourth Avenue
New York City

10 cents

C O N T E N T S

	PAGE
THE PROPOSAL	5
BASIC CHRISTIAN TEACHINGS	6
GUIDING PRINCIPLES OF THE CHURCHES	7
THE PROBLEM DEFINED	11
The Distribution of Colonies	12
Germany's Demands	13
Population	14
Markets	16
Raw Materials	17
Prestige	19
AN ALTERNATIVE TO REALLOCATION	20
SATISFYING THE NEEDS OF NATIONS	25
BRITISH SUGGESTIONS	25
WHAT IS INVOLVED FOR AMERICA?	30
WHAT CAN YOU DO ABOUT IT?	31
BIBLIOGRAPHY	32

FOREWORD

THE CHURCHES dare not be indifferent to the problem of colonies. They are concerned with all peoples everywhere both because of the implications of their world view and because of the divine commission to preach the Gospel. How long will Christians be taken seriously when they preach the Gospel if their actions as citizens are not in harmony with their religious professions?

In Africa, for example, the churches maintain missions which have made an incalculable contribution to the welfare of the people. Now the suggestion is made that some of these African peoples be assigned to certain nations, notably Germany, as so much property in the game of politics among strong military powers. Since such a proposal is unjust to the African peoples involved, must not Christians who are citizens of the responsible powers protest the injustice, both on the higher grounds of inherent obligation, and on the lower grounds of maintaining the respect and trust of those among whom they wish to continue missionary work? The churches have preached the equality of all men as children of God and brothers in Christ. How can they assent, then, to the exploitation which is involved in making certain peoples the footballs of empire politics?

The churches are therefore concerned with the principles involved in the problem of colonies. Political and economic considerations are secondary. We take them into account to indicate the relevance of the principles to the immediate and practical aspects of international conflicts and war threats today.

Moreover, if the churches are interested in peace, they must be interested in liberty. Both are requisite to the building of the Kingdom of God. One cannot permanently exist without the other. The passion for liberty as a right of man and the passion for peace must be inextricably related.

It is difficult to approach the problem of colonies objectively at a time when so much emotion and prejudice are mingled with reason in our attitudes toward the nations involved. We are prepared to condemn the acts of Germany, Italy and Japan, generally, to condone England and France, and to rationalize our own questionable conduct. In appealing for an objective approach to the problem we do not ask for the suspending of judgment. Unjust behavior must be condemned. But the objective approach demands that we condemn injustice wherever we see it.

Those nations which have recently seized territory by military conquest answer our expressions of indignation by pointing out that they are doing nothing more than we have done in the past,—in taking territory from Mexico or in capturing the Philippines, for example. We answer that new standards of international conduct prevail today, that all nations have voluntarily subscribed to those standards, and that progress in civilization requires our discarding lower standards for higher and then enforcing compliance with the higher. But if our answer is to be convincing in its sincerity, may it not be expected of us that we be willing to surrender the “loot” of conquest under the outmoded standards of the earlier dispensation? We believe that a reasonable and objective approach to the problem of colonies requires a willingness to examine the policies of all nations while we condemn Japan’s conquest of Manchuria, Italy’s seizure of Ethiopia and Germany’s demands for the return of her former colonies. We can surely be reasonable without being irresponsible or unmoral and without being guilty of condoning injustice.

THE PROPOSAL

“CONTENTION over colonies has been an important cause of war in the past and constitutes one of the most serious threats of war today. We must, therefore, raise the whole question of the policy of nations holding colonies.

“Has not the time come for the churches to declare their commitment to the principle of freedom for subject peoples which involves the ultimate freeing of colonies and the drastic modification of the whole colonial system? The abolition of chattel slavery was one of the great steps forward in human society. The churches were of great service to the world in establishing the principle, based upon their gospel, that no man has a right to hold another man in involuntary servitude. Should not this same principle be extended to groups of men? If it should, then the conscience of the world should repudiate the practice of one nation holding another nation in involuntary servitude.

“We believe that the principle of eventual freedom for all peoples is not only the recognition of an essential right but is also a prerequisite to the creation of that sense of justice and goodwill without which we cannot hope to rid the world of wars.

“The current discussions of world politics which imply the right of certain nations to bargain with each other over the destiny of other peoples indicates that the old theory of colonies still prevails to a large extent. If a new principle were to be established in the near future statesmen would find ways for putting it into effect in practical terms and many of the tensions underlying present international relations would be relieved.

“Therefore in the interests of both peace and justice we call upon the churches of America and of other nations to urge upon their governments the acceptance of this principle and the inauguration of steps to put it into effect.”

Adopted, January 25, 1938, by a conference of 76 church leaders, and on January 28 received by the Executive Committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America and commended to the churches as a basis for study and action.

BASIC CHRISTIAN TEACHINGS

The Christian rule of faith and practice is to be found in the Word of God. Our primary concern is to discover and to proclaim the Christian principles which apply to a problem which is essentially an ethical problem. The following quotations suggest an attitude toward our study of the relationship between peoples:

1. Acts 17:24-26

“God that made the world and all things therein . . . hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth.”

2. John 3:16

“For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son . . .”

3. John 10:16

“And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold, and one shepherd.”

4. Mark 16:15

“And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.”

5. Colossians 3:11

“Where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free: but Christ is all, and in all.”

6. I Corinthians 12:12-14

“For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that body, being many, are one body: so also is Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit. For the body is not one member, but many.”

7. Isaiah 66:18

“It shall come, that I will gather all nations and tongues; and they shall come, and see my glory.”

8. Revelation 7:9, 10

“After this I beheld, and, lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands; and cried with a loud voice, saying, Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb.”

GUIDING PRINCIPLES OF THE CHURCHES

American churches are not alone in their concern over the problem. The most widely representative church assembly of recent years—the Conference of the Universal Christian Council on Church, Community and State, meeting at Oxford, England, in 1937—gave the problem thorough consideration and arrived at conclusions represented in the following statements taken from the Conference Message:

“The fact that no superior political agency exists to impose from time to time a new order in international affairs to conform to changing needs means not that the existing order will remain static but that change can occur in only one of two ways—namely, by voluntary action or by force, or the menace of force.

“It therefore particularly devolves upon Christians to devote themselves to securing by voluntary action of their nations such changes in the international order as are from time to time required to avoid injustice and to promote equality of opportunity for individuals throughout the world. Christian influence to this end cannot be made effective without adequate factual knowledge. To meet this initial need Christians should take measures to obtain information on world conditions more adequate and reliable than that now furnished by the secular and nationalistic agencies, which are too prone to ignore or belittle the needs of alien peoples, or to express those needs in terms of sacrifice to be made by nations other than their own.

“Once the need of change is apprehended its accomplishment depends upon governmental action. This will require of statesmen and politicians a broader vision than now exists of the true welfare of their nation. The heads of States, under whatever form of government, are ultimately dependent upon the support of their people, who must make it clear that they are prepared to accept temporary sacrifices in order that a greater good may ultimately emerge.

“The unequal distribution of natural bounties is one of the causes of war, if control is used to create a monopoly of national advantages. Christian people should move their governments to abstain from such policies and to provide a reasonable equality of economic opportunity.”

* * * * *

“The Christian sees distinctions of race as part of God’s purpose to enrich mankind with a diversity of gifts. Against racial pride or race antagonism the Church must set its face implacably as rebellion against God. Especially, in its own life and worship there can be no barriers because of race or color. Similarly the Christian accepts national communities as part of God’s purpose to enrich and diversify human life. Every man is called of God to serve his fellows in the community to which he belongs. But national egotism tending to the suppression of other nationalities or of minorities is, no less than individual egotism, a sin against the Creator of all peoples and races.”

* * * * *

“For Christians, the starting point in this as in every problem of the relations of men is the affirmation that all men are by birthright children of God created in his image, and therefore brothers and sisters to one another. They are, moreover, ‘brothers for whom Christ died’.”

These Christian principles have been recognized in a general way in the policies of nations, even though they have not been adequately applied in practice in dealings with colonies.

In the American Declaration of Independence they are set forth as the basis for national policy, for that cherished and historic pronouncement affirmed the principles that nations had the right “to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God entitle them” and that “Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.”

In a letter (February 13, 1937) printed in *Amerasia*, commenting on the American approach to the problem of relations between the United States and countries in the Far East, Dr. Stanley K. Hornbeck, Chief of the Far Eastern Division of the State Department, writes:

“Among the people of this country there has prevailed the concept that all men should have opportunity for self-realization. Translating this into the political field, the people of the United States have believed that laws should not be discriminatory, that laws should in fact provide for and as far as possible ensure equality of opportunity. Projecting these concepts into the field of international relations, they have believed in principles which are expressed in the formulæ of ‘sovereignty,’ ‘independence,’ ‘equality of states,’ and ‘equality of opportunity.’”

Sir Samuel Hoare, the then Foreign Minister of Great Britain, in an address before the Assembly of the League of Nations in 1935, said:

“It is in accordance with what we believe to be the underlying principles of the League that our people have steadily promoted and still promote the growth of self-government in their own territories. . . . We believe that small nations are entitled to a life of their own and to such protection as can collectively be afforded them in the maintenance of their national life. We believe, on undoubted evidence of past and present times, that all nations alike have a valuable contribution to make to the common stock of humanity.

“We believe that the backward nations are, without prejudice to their independence and integrity, entitled to expect that assistance will be afforded them by the more advanced peoples in the development of their resources and the upbuilding of their national life.

“The fact remains that some countries, either in their native soil or in their colonial territories, do possess what appear to be preponderant advantages, and that other, less favored, view the situation with anxiety. Especially as regards colonial raw materials, it is not unnatural that such a state of affairs should give rise to fear lest exclusive monopolies be set up at the expense of those countries not possessing colonial empires.”

THE PROBLEM DEFINED

There are two aspects of the problem both of which we must consider. First, What is to be done about the current demand of certain world powers for colonial territory, especially the demand of Germany for the return of colonies held by her prior to the World War; second, What is to be done about the whole colonial system?

There may not be economic and political validity to the division of world powers into "haves" and "have-nots." But a superficial consideration of certain obvious facts leads the people of some nations to conclude that they do not have their share of the world's goods and that to obtain their share it is necessary to gain control of colonies or other dependent territory. Germany, Italy and Japan have a combined population of about 177 million. About 217 million people live in the United States, the United Kingdom and France. The first named 3 powers control 2,297,848 square miles of the earth's surface, whereas the latter group of nations controls 21,923,477 square miles. (See article by Hanson W. Baldwin, New York Times, October 17, 1937.)

Brooks Emeny in "The Strategy of Raw Materials" presents statistics which would indicate that the United States, Great Britain and France have a total horsepower output four times as great as that of the other three nations combined. The so-called "have" nations enjoy 39% of world trade and the "have-not" nations 15%.

It is necessary to interpret all these statistics before we draw conclusions as to their economic significance. However, it is quite obvious that the bold facts as they are presented to the uncritical populations of Germany, Italy and Japan lead them to the conclusion that there is a grave inequality among the nations.

Any solution of the immediate problem created by Germany's demands must be related to the fundamental questions of principle involved in the whole colonial system. We should be quite as much concerned with attaining justice for the peoples that constitute colonies as with achieving justice for the powers.

It becomes obvious, therefore, that we are concerned here, not only with a problem of immediate political expedience, but with a fundamental theory of world order which will define that kind of relationship for the various peoples and nations which will serve the ends of justice, liberty and right for all who may be involved.

THE DISTRIBUTION OF COLONIES

JAPAN	Korea, Formosa, Manchoukuo, German Islands (mandate).
ITALY	Libya, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Italian Somaliland.
ENGLAND	Nigeria, Gold Coast, Kenya, Burma, Malay Peninsula, Ceylon, Newfoundland, part of Borneo and numerous islands, British Somaliland and the Mandates: Southwest Africa (Union of South Africa Mandate), Tanganyika Territory, part of the Cameroons, Territory of Western Samoa, Palestine, Territory of New Guinea, and Nauru.
FRANCE	French Sudan, Morocco, Algeria, Tunis, Madagascar, Indo-China, French Somaliland. Mandates: part of the Cameroons, Syria.
NETHERLANDS	Netherlands Indies.

BELGIUM	Belgian Congo.
PORTUGAL	Angola, Mozambique.
UNITED STATES	The Philippine Islands, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands.

GERMANY'S DEMANDS

Germany is not the only nation demanding colonies or other control over territory, but her claim is the most insistent now, so we take it as an example. Two quotations from speeches of Adolf Hitler indicate the nature of the case he sets forth:

“In our economic life there is only one question which has for years continued to give us the greatest trouble: it is the difficulty of our food supply. The German scope is too small, without being supplemented by colonies, to guarantee an undisturbed, certain and permanent nourishment of our people. In the long run it is an intolerable thought to be dependent from year to year on the accident of a good or bad harvest. The claim to colonial possessions belonging to the Reich is therefore based on our economic distress, and the attitude of the other Powers to this claim is simply incomprehensible. . . . We have a harder struggle to carry on than others. One hundred and thirty-seven persons per square kilometre are more difficult to feed than 11 or 12.”

“There are rich people who say: ‘Wealth is a burden, which is very heavy to carry. Let no one yearn for wealth, lest this burden should be placed upon him.’ One would think that if wealth is such a heavy burden, those who possess it should be glad to give some of it away. But they do not want to give up any part of their burden. They say colonies have no value. But they do not want under any circumstances to give back these ‘valueless’ colonies to their rightful owners.”

If other nations are permanently to hold colonies, it is difficult to reject the logic of Germany's claim. We must take seriously, therefore, the suggestion that one effective way of meeting it is for all nations that now hold colonies to agree to relinquish them under appropriate conditions.

POPULATION

The number of people living in a given territory does not necessarily determine whether that territory is overpopulated or not. A country is overpopulated when it has difficulty in feeding its population and maintaining it on a standard of living which does not compare unfavorably with that of countries with approximately the same achievement of civilization. Neither Belgium nor the Netherlands is popularly supposed to be overpopulated even though both countries have a population of more than 600 per square mile, whereas, Japan, Germany and Italy talk of overpopulation although they have only 435, 370 and 360 per square mile of national territory respectively. (See "Colonies, Trade and Prosperity," by Maxwell Stewart.) As the density of population per square mile of arable land increases, it becomes necessary to adjust the national economy in the direction of greater industrialization. A nation may utilize its resources of man power to produce manufactured goods in excess of its own needs so that it may export them to other nations in exchange for foodstuffs and other raw materials. In this way, as well as by the selling of services, a nation may attain a high standard of living for a dense population.

It is frequently assumed that when a nation develops a dense population, it can relieve its population problem by acquiring new territory into which its surplus will migrate. But such has not been the experience of nations which have

had colonies. Most of the colonies lie in the torrid zone where the people from the overpopulated nations find it difficult, if not impossible, to become acclimated. But even when the territory is suitable in climate, it is often difficult for "foreigners" to adjust themselves to the conditions of a strange country. People are usually reluctant to leave their homelands to settle in other territory if the standards of living there are even lower than at home. For example, the Japanese have been reluctant to go to Korea or Manchuria. Because of the mountainous nature of the Japanese islands, where population in proportion to arable land area is the most dense of any nation, it might be assumed that their incentive to migrate would be greatest. But in nearly forty years the Japanese colonies, though still comparatively sparsely populated, have received less than one year's increase of the Japanese population. In 1905 Japan won South Manchuria from Russia at a cost of some 300,000 men, but in 1930 only 200,000 Japanese had settled there. The Japanese do not want to leave home. Sweden, however, with much less congested population, has sent more emigrants abroad in the last half century than has Japan.

In 1914 there were only 22,000 Germans in all the German colonies in Africa and only about 2,000 in the other German colonies. And even this very limited colonization had been heavily subsidized.

"Nearly three-quarters of the territory outside of Europe which is controlled by European governments is in Africa, not including British Dominions, but less than 2% of the net emigration from Europe has come to Africa and those who have stayed there are less than .06% of Europe's present population." (See "A Place in the Sun," by Grover Clark.)

One of the most interesting facts about modern migrations is that Chinese emigration has been considerably larger than that from any European country. About 9,000,000 Chinese

today live outside of China. This is a considerably larger number than that of the nationals of any European country living abroad, and the Chinese have gone without asking that their flag and the protection of their nation go with them. Moreover, the Chinese Government has spent practically nothing in trying to gain advantages for its people who have migrated.

MARKETS

If the problems of a nation are not to be solved by large emigration of its population it must maintain its standard of living either by devising new and more efficient methods of producing essential foodstuffs and commodities or by exporting the surplus in order to be able to purchase its requirements abroad. It cannot buy unless it can sell. Therefore, it must have markets for its surplus.

It has been assumed that the political control of a foreign territory assured preference in its market and that, consequently, trade would follow the flag. This assumption must be examined in the light of the recent experience of colonial and non-colonial powers in distinction from the experience of the early days of empire building when the conquering nation exercised practically a monopolistic control. In this connection the history of trade with the former German colonies since they became British Mandates is enlightening. In 1934, 42% of the imports of the Cameroons still were purchased from Germany and 80% of its exports went to the Reich, even though the territory had become a British Mandate. Though the percentages are large those colonial markets were negligible in comparison with total export trade, even before the war. "Germany before the war sold to her own colonies about half of one per cent of her exports." (See "Imperialism and World Politics," Foreign Policy Association, page 53.)

Other nations are cutting in seriously on Great Britain's trade with her territories. For example, in India, Japan is now selling more textiles than England herself. The same is true for the Malay Peninsula. Ninety-nine per cent of the artificial silk imported into Tanganyika is Japanese and in Kenya the purchases of Japanese textiles are six times those of British textiles. (See "The Fallacy of Conquest," by Nathaniel Peffer, page 125.)

"The last full year of Germany's control, all of her former colonies together took exactly .6% of Germany's exports." (See "Colonies for Germany?" by Willson Woodside, April, 1938, Harpers Magazine.)

"Colonial populations with their low standards of living and few needs afford only very limited markets for the products of modern industrialized countries. All colonies together absorbed only 9.29% of world exports in 1929, and 11.54% in 1934." (See "Raw Materials in World Politics"—Foreign Policy Association.)

It must be pointed out, however, that for certain industries colonial markets are very important. This is true especially for textiles, machinery and other iron and steel products. Some would argue that the profits of colonial export trade are enjoyed by only a very small section of the population, but the profits of those industries may be scattered fairly widely through the population in wages and dividends not only in the industries directly involved in production of the exported commodities but also in transportation and other related industries.

RAW MATERIALS

Another aspect of the problem is the need of certain nations for a more adequate supply of raw materials and the allegedly inequitable distribution of them at present. It is

popularly assumed that a reallocation of colonies would solve this problem, thus relieving unemployment and raising the standard of living of those nations which would, under the reallocation, receive certain colonial territory. It is to be granted immediately that Germany, Japan and Italy need to import large quantities of raw materials not produced within their own borders, but we must analyze the assumption that a reallocation of colonies would solve the problem.

Colonies are a much less important source of raw materials in world trade than is popularly supposed. The Raw Materials Committee of the League of Nations estimates "that including production both for domestic consumption and for export the total production of all commercially important raw materials in all colonial territories (excluding dominions and other self-governing territories) is not more than about 3% of world production." When the amount of such materials used for domestic consumption is deducted from the total it becomes obvious that the supply of such materials available for the powers is of comparatively negligible importance, and that even with a wholesale transfer of colonial territories, the raw material needs of the powers could not thus be substantially met. (See "Raw Materials and Foreign Policy," by Herbert Feis, *Foreign Affairs*, July, 1938.)

Germany asks the return of her African colonies partly on the basis of the need of raw materials, and yet she secured from those colonies in 1913 just one-half of one per cent of her raw materials.

Even the colonial powers are not adequately supplied within their own territories. Great Britain finds it necessary to look elsewhere for a substantial amount of her requirements.

It is obvious, therefore, that an adequate supply of raw materials for industrialized nations can be obtained only through widespread international trade which assumes a freer

exchange of goods, not only between the great powers and colonial territories, but more essentially among the great powers themselves.

The restrictions upon trade among the powers and the preferential trade regulations between colonial territories and the holding nations greatly accentuate the seeming importance of colonies because whatever materials a colony can supply are accessible to the holding nation on terms which the latter can largely dictate.

The importance of materials essential for the maintenance of the military establishment may lead the power to pay a price unwarranted by the returns from ordinary trade, in order to obtain control of that source of supply. However, ownership is no guarantee of control. In time of war control of the lines of trade determines the availability of supply, and a country which can pay the price for materials can usually find those who will take considerable risk in order to obtain the profits derived from the sale. The risks run by shippers to Loyalist Spain are an example.

PRESTIGE

Even in spite of the demonstration of the very limited economic value of those colonies which are involved in the current discussions of reallocation, the psychological factor persists. There is a tradition that a great power, unless it has a large expanse of undeveloped territory, such as Russia, has not won for itself "a place in the sun" unless it owns colonies. This tradition persists in spite of the obvious prosperity of the Scandinavian countries and Switzerland, which have no colonies. They maintain a high standard of living and a satisfactory degree of industrialization which depends to a large extent on foreign trade, and yet they have no foreign markets over which they exercise imperial control.

The fiction of the tremendous economic value of colonies is maintained in part by the reports of trade which is profitable to a few people. But the costs to the taxpayer of maintaining the colony are buried and lost in the national budget. Consequently even though Italy and Japan, as well as Germany, have in the past paid huge bills for securing and administering colonial territory, the taxpayer supports the military machine for policing and defending the territory and pays for the subsidy which is often required for private enterprise without complaining, because he is not aware of just how much it costs him and because the prestige of his nation is enhanced by its rating as a colonial power. *Therefore, so long as some nations hold colonies and others who consider themselves to be in the "have-not" category are deprived of them there will be occasion for envy and strife and the vicious circle of building military machines to hold colonies and consequently seeking colonies to supply the military machines will continue unbroken.*

AN ALTERNATIVE TO REALLOCATION

The German demand for the return of her former colonies implies the right of nations to pass subject peoples from one master to another much as a slaveholder might sell a slave to a purchaser either for a cash price or as a satisfaction of an obligation. This raises a serious ethical question. It also raises the question of immediate practical expedience because, if the ceding of colonies by one power to another is legitimate, every power realizes that it is impossible to determine when the process will stop; no one can tell when a nation which makes demands for certain territories today will consider its demands satisfied. Moreover, the nations which control large colonial resources cannot be expected to surrender their own advantage voluntarily to another nation especially when that other nation is a potential enemy or an economic rival.

However, it is generally recognized that there will almost inevitably be war unless some provision can be made for the legitimate economic needs of those nations which at the present time are most in need of economic resources beyond their own borders. The resources of nations change from time to time. Consequently, their needs change. As their needs change their rights change. That is, we live in a dynamic world in which there must inevitably be change in the relationships between nations. Change comes about in one of three ways:

1. By the orderly process of negotiation, of give and take, much as most economic and political change takes place within a nation.
2. By concessions by one nation to another which are the result of threat.
3. By war.

Obviously, all nations prefer to have change take place by the first process. At the present time the reallocation of colonies to Germany is being considered under the conditions of the second process because it is assumed to be an alternative to war, and it is justified by some people on the grounds that it is wise to make such a concession rather than to become involved in war.

If an alternative to the reallocation of colonies can be found, change by the process of peaceful negotiation can be effected, and a war threat eliminated.

The alternative which we are here considering in our Proposal is that of abandoning the whole colonial system and in its place setting up a system under which the right of all peoples to their freedom shall be recognized and a procedure established for the progressive application of that principle. It is not assumed that all colonies will be granted their unconditional independence immediately because it is a well-known fact that some of them are not sufficiently trained and experi-

enced in government to manage their own affairs wisely and efficiently. Therefore, it is proposed that the theory of international trusteeship, which would involve a modification and extension of the mandates system, should be adopted. Under such a procedure, those peoples which are as yet inexperienced and incapable of effective self-administration would have the assistance of the skill and experience of other nations.

The various alternatives which should be presented to a colony for choice by plebiscite might be somewhat as follows:

1. *Complete independence*, with its neutrality guaranteed by treaty with and among the powers so that it would not be subject to conquest by another nation which might pounce upon it as soon as it surrendered the protection of a strong imperial power. Such provision is made in the Philippine Independence Act which calls upon the President of the United States to "enter into negotiations with foreign powers with a view to the conclusion of a treaty for the perpetual neutralization of the Philippine Islands."

2. *Independence subject to supervision* of an international commission of trustees, or an international mandate commission on which would be represented not only powers which now hold colonies, but also Germany, Scandinavian, Central European and South American nations. Such a commission would supervise the administration of the mandated state's affairs in the special interest of no one nation. The open door to trade and investment would be maintained. No militarization of the mandate would be permitted; *i.e.*, it would permit no military establishment except such as would be required for local police duty. No power would be permitted to maintain a naval base in the territory.

3. *Independence subject to supervision* of one mandatory power which would be accountable to an international mandates commission and which would be obliged to render

a public accounting of its trusteeship. The open door to trade would be maintained.

4. *Voluntary continuance of the status quo.* If the inhabitants of a colony prefer to continue subject to a particular power, that is their right. However, it would be imperative that the plebiscite should be conducted by an international commission and that opportunity be assured for free discussion of the alternative proposals before such a plebiscite was taken. Otherwise, undue influence by the present controlling power would be inevitable and there would be no genuine process of self-determination.

Under any of the first three alternatives, equitable provision would necessarily be made for just and appropriate regard for foreign investments in the territory involved.

The report on "Colonies as Economic Problems" of the Conference on World Economic Cooperation under the auspices of the National Peace Conference, held at Washington in March, 1938, is to be noted as suggesting modification of the colonial system:

"There should be effective guarantees of equality of access (not necessarily unlimited access) for all nations to the resources and the markets of all non-self-governing areas. As steps in this direction we recommend:

"1. That a multilateral treaty be negotiated for the suppression of discriminatory export duties; that some international machinery for checking on observances of open-door pledges be established; and that the open-door principle be extended as rapidly as possible by the making of treaties for that purpose.

"2. That any change which involves a shift from mandate status to purely colonial status should be regarded as a step backward. In areas under mandate the administering power is obligated to live up to certain minimum standards

with regard to the interests of native populations and of outside countries, and to make a periodical report to an impartial expert commission. There is no international control over administration of purely colonial areas.

“3. That the ideal toward which the world should work is either direct international administration or much stronger application of the mandates principle in all non-self-governing areas, including the colonies of Great Britain, France, the United States, and other powers, as well as in the former German colonies.

“4. That the question of restoration or non-restoration of the former German colonies be handled as the purely political problem that it is. Its direct economic significance either for Germany or for the countries that now administer mandates over the former German colonies is very minute. The chances are that restoration of the former colonies to Germany, considering their relative poorness in resources, their poorness as markets, expenses of administration, and the necessity of purchasing materials from abroad with which to develop them, would lessen rather than increase Germany’s ‘access to raw materials’ over the next decade. The practical application of measures for equal access to trade and resources in colonial areas would reduce the bases of demands for colonies by European nations to considerations of prestige, military and naval strategy, and political equality.

“5. That the public mind should be on guard against exaggerating the importance for economic welfare of possessing or not possessing colonies. ‘Population pressure’ is most sensibly interpreted in terms of standard of living and not in terms of number of people per square mile. It is doubtful whether colonial shifts would have any great effect on ‘population pressure’ in this realistic sense, especially if practical measures for equality of economic access are extended.”

SATISFYING THE NEEDS OF NATIONS

To grant existing colonies their independence or to place them under such a mandate supervision as we have described will guarantee an open door and facilitate the solution of the four aspects of the problem which we have enumerated, namely: population, raw materials, markets, and prestige.

Population: The population problem is essentially that of establishing and maintaining an adequate standard of living through industrialization which involves foreign trade. If no power has control over a dependent territory the so-called "have-not" nations will have the same opportunity for foreign trade as any other nation.

Markets: With discriminatory restrictions removed the "have-not" nations will have access to markets and will be able to compete with other nations in those commodities which they are able to produce more economically.

Raw Materials: If there are no colonies the nations can bid without disadvantage in the open market for what they need from the present colonial territories.

Prestige: If no nation has colonies there will be no invidious comparisons among the nations and national pride will not be involved.

BRITISH SUGGESTIONS

We have already quoted (page 10) Sir Samuel Hoare's address to the League of Nations in which he accepted the principle of the self-determination of subject peoples in theory. Great Britain has not yet accepted the principle in practice, but her policy has been tending in that direction as she has sought gradually to evolve the British Empire into the British Commonwealth of Nations.

There are groups in England who are working for the

immediate application of this principle to national policy as it is related to the German demand for colonies. Since more drastic adjustment would be required of England than of America, in releasing colonies, it is appropriate that we should quote at length from a document entitled "The Colonial Question," dated January, 1938, prepared by Leonard Barnes, formerly an official in the British Colonial Service, and published by the National Peace Council of London:

"With the Halifax mission to Germany last November the Colonial question entered a new phase. German policy has succeeded in bringing it into close relation with the European question. Britain and France, from their side, are now contemplating concessions to the Central Powers over a wide field, though the idea for the moment is to make concessions only as part of a general settlement which will carry its own guarantees in the form of some agreed limitation (perhaps even reduction) of armaments.

"The largest of the possible concessions was indicated in a phrase in the communique that the Prime Minister read to the House of Commons on November 30th, when reporting on the London discussions with Mm. Chautemps and Delbos which followed the Hitler-Halifax conversations. 'A preliminary examination was made of the Colonial question in all its aspects.' Three provisos were added: (1) that the colonial question could not be considered in isolation, (2) that it would involve a number of other countries, and (3) that it would require extended study.

"It is clear that some form of colonial revision is now envisaged by all the chief Powers concerned, and that the question has come to stay, and will occupy a prominent place in international negotiations until a settlement is arrived at. Instead of conceding Europe to save the colonies, as was feared in some quarters, the British Government now looks like making colonial concessions in the hope of saving Europe.

“The colonial question, properly understood, is not just a wrangle between great Powers; it is a question of right and wrong. Ultimately its solution depends on ordinary people understanding that colonial Empires are wrong.

“By distributing Germany’s colonies (and, for that matter, Turkey’s, too) at the end of the last war, the victor Powers took a short step forward and a long step back. The mandate system in itself was an advance in colonial theory; it sketched the outlines of a new conception of Empire. But it was also used to conceal the fact that a few Powers, all of them hardened imperialists, were seizing the colonies of another Power as the prize of victory.

“The pushing of the German colonial claims to the forefront of the diplomatic stage requires that the ambiguity inherent in the shuffling procedure by which the mandate system was first set up should be resolved. Was what happened in 1919 simply that Britain and France added to their already vast possessions at Germany’s expense? If so, Germany has at least as good a case for demanding her colonies back as Britain and France have for retaining them. All three are great Powers, all are industrious nations, all have big guns and a feeling of superiority to the dark races. On the level of power politics the only difference is that Germany lost one empire by losing a war, while Britain and France gained a second empire each by winning it. There is no room for moral arguments here. At the same time, nothing could be plainer than that the colonial problem will never be solved by adding one nation to the list of “haves” and subtracting one from the list of “have-nots.” What the world needs, and it is of the world that we have to think, is not more imperial Powers, but fewer.

“Or, on the other hand, did Britain and France really mean what they said when they established the mandate system and forwent the outright annexation of the ex-German colonies? Did they honestly believe that the ‘well-being and develop-

ment of primitive peoples form a sacred trust of civilization'? Were they frankly discarding the old imperialist assumptions and the tradition of national possession? If so, they certainly provided themselves with grounds which were valid, then, and remain valid now, for refusing the restoration of her colonies to Germany. They did indeed afford themselves and the world what they and the world need even more urgently today than in 1919—an escape from the endless vicious circle of the division and re-division of the spoils. But in that case it is high time they proved their sincerity by advancing farther along the new road.

EXTENDING THE MANDATE PRINCIPLE

“There is no reason in logic or common sense why the mandate principle should in its application stop short at the colonies which changed hands after the last war. Any attempt to stop it short at that point can only operate as evidence that the so-called principle was no principle, but an evasive subterfuge. There was no real defense for stopping it short there in 1919; there is none whatever today. It follows, therefore, that the British and French Governments should begin at once to extend the mandate principle to such of their own colonies as are not yet ripe for self-government, to revoke all economic restrictions not applied in the direct interests of native populations, and better still, to offer the mandated territories for international administration. Unless we and the French are prepared to surrender our own exclusive colonial privileges and control, we have neither any moral argument for resisting the German demand for similar privileges and control, nor any principle but sterile opportunism for dealing with Germany's claim in any other way.”

* * * * *

“One point calls for emphasis at the outset. International control under mandate is not an end in itself. It is essentially an interim arrangement designed first and foremost to train the native peoples concerned for self-government in the shortest possible time. It is doomed to failure if it comes into conflict with, or comes to be regarded by native opinion as being opposed to, native liberationist movements in the dependencies themselves. That is why it is important that those who sponsor international control should at the same time concern themselves with ensuring for colonial peoples the civil liberties that we hold to be the necessary foundation not only of a democratic order, but even of a civilized life. One must go further than this. In order to demonstrate to the colonial world at large that the scheme is genuinely transitional to self-government, self-government should actually be conferred at the beginning on certain colonies which are approximately ready for its exercise. Ceylon and some of the West Indian islands are parts of the British Empire which have evident claims to such treatment.”

* * * * *

“Such, in broad outline, is the answer to the long-term question of what to do with colonial empires. It is within the framework afforded by this scheme that the answer to the short-term question of what to do about Germany’s present colonial claims must fall. The scheme does not, it is true, meet the German demand for the return of her old colonies and for a private German empire whose doors can be closed to other countries. But it transforms the whole nature of the colonial question, removes it from the sphere of self-regarding nationalist rivalries, and relates it to a world community and a world order. It offers Germany, on condition that her lapsed membership of the League is resumed, equality in the colonial sphere, and makes her and all other League members

responsible associates in a common task, instead of jealous competitors for exclusive privileges. In a word, in limiting the 'haves' to what they have a right to retain, it confers on the 'have-nots' all that they have a right to ask. And it does this in a way which not only leaves open but even expedites the one final solution of the colonial problem—the independence of colonial peoples.”

WHAT IS INVOLVED FOR THE UNITED STATES?

THE PHILIPPINES: There is a clause in Section 11 of the Philippine Independence Act which calls upon the President of the United States “to enter into negotiations with foreign powers with a view to the conclusion of a treaty for the perpetual neutralization of the Philippine Islands.” This provision could be carried out in such a way as to set up the equivalent of an international mandate. It constitutes a clear recognition of the principle and procedure which should be more generally applied.

PUERTO RICO: In November, 1937, a bill was introduced in Congress to grant to Puerto Rico the right to say in a plebiscite what status she desires. The bill was not voted upon. To adopt this measure would grant the Puerto Ricans the right of self-determination, including the possibility of their continuing in their present status by choice.

THE VIRGIN ISLANDS: The same proposal which has been made for Puerto Rico should be applied to the Virgin Islands.

CHINA: Our government should communicate to China our willingness to surrender our privileges of extra-territoriality when and if China desires us to do so.

WHAT CAN YOU DO ABOUT IT?

If you agree with the Proposal on page 5, you can take these steps:

1. Write to the Secretary of State and to your senators and congressmen about your convictions, calling upon them to bring our American policy into line with this principle.
2. Persuade your friends to study the problem.
3. Get groups in your church to study and take action.
4. Obtain copies of "Colonies and the Problem of International Justice," a 10-page summary of the main points of this pamphlet, from the Department of International Justice and Goodwill. Free for personal distribution in small quantities.
5. Report to the Department of International Justice and Goodwill what you have done.

* * * * *

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. "THE ALTERNATIVE TO INTERNATIONAL ANARCHY—The Christian Contribution to Political World Order." Order from the Department of International Justice and Goodwill, or the Committee on International Relations of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America. 10 cents.
2. "THE CHURCHES AND THE INTERNATIONAL CRISIS"—A message to the churches from a conference of seventy-six church leaders, approved for reference and study by the Executive Committee of the Federal Council of Churches, January 28, 1938. 5 cents.
3. "PEACEFUL CHANGE"—A Headline Book of the Foreign Policy Association adopted as the principal textbook for the Campaign for World Economic Cooperation of the National Peace Conference. 25 cents.
4. "COLONIES, TRADE AND PROSPERITY"—Prepared by Maxwell S. Stewart on the basis of memoranda published by a Joint Committee of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and the International Chamber of Commerce. 10 cents.
5. "RAW MATERIALS IN WORLD POLITICS"—By John C. DeWilde. Foreign Policy Association Report, September 15, 1936. Foreign Policy Association, 8 West 40th Street, New York City, 25 cents.
6. "THE FALLACY OF CONQUEST"—By Nathaniel Peffer, in the March, 1936 issue of *International Conciliation*, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 405 West 117th Street, New York City. 5 cents.
7. "THE COLONIAL PROBLEM"—A Report by a Study Group of Members of the Royal Institute of International Affairs. Oxford University Press.
8. "THE ANNALS" of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, July, 1938.

